DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 789 SE 010 812

AUTHOR	Roe, Michael
TITLE	Drugs and the Schools, Report of a Seminar Convened by the Canadian Education Association (1st, Toronto, Ontario, June 15-16, 1970).
INSTITUTION	Canadian Education Association, Toronto (Ontario).
PUB DATE	Jun 70
NOTE	50p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Canadian Education Assoc., 252 Bloor St., W., Toronto 5, Ontario ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Drug Abuse, Educational Problems, Educational Programs, *Opinions, School Community Cooperation, *School Responsibility, *Seminars, Student Problems

ABSTRACT

Contained in this report of a seminar convened by the Canadian Education Association in June, 1970, is a sampling of views and opinions of educators on the non-medical use of drugs among school-age young people. It presents a general overview of the considerations which must be taken into account before the schools can react with confidence and competence to the drug phenomenon. Principal points discussed included development of a central source for information on drugs, the role of students, educators, and outside professionals as well as the schools in helping to solve the drug problems, causes of the drug phenomenon, the need for realistic objectives, and the success of projects started in some school systems. Seminar sessions explored the schools' responsibilities and priorities, coordination of community resources, involvement of youth and parents, counseling-treatment-rehabilitation, developing school-community programs, and curriculum considerations. Delegates and program participants are also listed. (BL)

ED046789

DRUGS AND THE SCHOOLS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SE 010 812

Report of a seminar convened by The Canadian Education Association,

ED0 46789

DRUGS AND THE SCHOOLS

Report of a seminar convened by
The Canadian Education Association,
June 15 and 16, 1970
Royal York Hotel, Toronto.

BY MICHAEL ROE

Published by The Canadian Education Association
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto 5, Ontario

PRICE: ONE DOLLAR

CONTENTS

Foreword..... 4

Seminar planning committee..... 6

The setting..... 7

Principal points discussed:

Central information source on drugs..... 8

What about outside experts?..... 9

Educators should play the key role.....10

Schools cannot act in a vacuum.....12

Causes of the drug phenomenon.....13

Realistic objectives necessary.....17

Two examples of school projects.....19

Vancouver's "special counsellor" scheme.....20

Summary of discussions at seminar sessions

The schools' responsibilities and priorities.....24

Co-ordination of community resources.....28

Involvement of youth and parents.....31

Counselling/treatment/rehabilitation.....34

Developing school/community programs.....39

Curriculum considerations.....43

Delegates and program participants.....46

Foreword

I am pleased that the Canadian Education Association decided to convene a seminar on the drug problem, inviting to it representatives of local school authorities, and provincial Departments of Education.

It is gratifying that so many felt that such a meeting, under our sponsorship, would be timely and useful. There were about 70 persons in attendance, with representatives from almost every province; there were senior officials, trustees, guidance and physical education specialists, as well as resource people representing such fields as law, medicine and pharmacy. The resultant discussions capitalized well upon the varying views of such a diverse group.

No single easy "solution" to the drug problem will be found in these pages, for such does not exist. However, on examination, this summary of the seminar discusssions does reveal broad patterns which may help Canadian schools devise appropriate measures to react effectively to this new phenomenon.

The essential feature of this report, and of the seminar upon which it is based, is that it shows representative thinking of school people from all parts of Canada, from Halifax to Victoria. The seminar was organized in such a way as deliberately to avoid theory, important as that is in many contexts.

A year ago, a Task Force which studied the role and work of the CEA recommended that the Association regularly convene seminars and other specialized meetings to achieve a pooling of the best knowledge and experience on various issues of concern to education. This has been the first such seminar, and it is my hope that there will be others. A practical approach of this nature to very real current problems is a fruitful approach for the CEA to take on a number of matters.

To this end, the Association needs the active support of, and close liaison with, local education authorities, especially the larger urban boards. I am sure this will be forthcoming to the extent that the CEA, in its various contacts, is able to sense and meet specific needs.

F. T. Atkinson,
President,
Canadian Education Association

Deputy Minister of Education,
New Brunswick.

Planning committee

A seven-man planning committee worked closely with CEA staff in structuring the program content of the seminar and naming appropriate program participants and resource persons:

Mr. A. Grant Gillespie (Chairman),
Director of Education,
York Board of Education.

Mr. Robert Couchman,
Head,
Counselling and Attendance Department,
Etobicoke Board of Education.

Mr. Charles Simmons,
Consultant for Special Programs,
North York Board of Education.

Mr. S. B. Montin,
Curriculum Co-ordinator,
Guidance and Educational Services,
Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Mr. R. K. Self,
Superintendent of Program,
Halton County Board of Education.

Mr. Robert H. Gray,
Assistant Director of Education,
Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.

Dr. L. D. Hamilton,
Superintendent of Curriculum,
Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

The setting

This is an attempt to report objectively the discussions and conversations of about 70 persons, almost all educators, who, for two days, shared opinions and experiences on the non-medical use of drugs among school-age young people. In privacy, away from the glare of the news media, delegates freely asked questions, challenged each other, stated their own views, and generally debated and discussed in an open and informal atmosphere.

Clearly, there was a wide variance of opinion, even of knowledge and experience. And clearly, most school boards, at least those represented, were in the initial searching stages of trying to find the best possible approach to the drug phenomenon and the causal factors behind it.

Opinions ranged from the unrealistic ostrich approach -- "the problem will disappear as the young people mature" -- to the radical approach -- "let the young people experiment with marijuana and hashish, they're not as bad as the chemical drugs."

But between these two extremes were views that are probably representative of the kind of discussion process which is, or will be, faced by virtually every school system in this country.

This report must be viewed in that context. It is not so much a distillation of the very best thought as it is a general overview of the considerations which must be taken into account before the schools can react with confidence and competence to the drug phenomenon.

To say that the drug phenomenon is complex is to repeat a truism that has become a cliche. But it is nonetheless a phenomenon which the schools, perhaps more than any other societal entity, must be prepared to deal with on the basis of knowledge and information that is reasoned, responsible and relevant.

The seminar convened by the Canadian Education Association, and this resultant report, will hopefully assist in a better understanding of the problem.

Principal points discussed

Central information source on drugs

The location of information about drugs was one of the concerns of the delegates. Some felt there should be one central office in Canada to which educators could write for the most current information on any and all aspects of the drug problem. This central office would operate as a clearing-house for current information on the legal, medical, educational and social aspects of the drug problem - acting both as a source for those seeking specific information, and as a disseminator of information on a broad scale using all available media.

Such a central office handling a mass of information and material might suggest a bureaucratic structure which would hamper rather than help easy access to relevant information. Also, it was suggested, such an office might tend to prolong the problem in order to perpetuate its own existence. However, in reality, a central information source could probably be built upon some existing body; in fact, such agencies as the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation (there are some others, as well) are already feeding information and literature to all parts of Canada, largely on a request basis.

It was suggested that each school board might appoint an outside "expert" as co-ordinator, part of whose job would be to set up and maintain a central resource centre of drug information for the board's own schools - thus making it easier for teachers and students to obtain information, as it would be available locally. Still, this would not seem to obviate the need for an effective clearing-house operating on a national scale.

The delegates most in favour of establishing the position of co-ordinator at the board level were the administrative officials. The trustees, teachers and co-ordinators, as well as the students, were more in favour of having this position filled by some educator presently employed by the board. Outside "experts," it was felt, are best used as resource personnel for in-service education of teachers, particularly at the elementary level where the teacher-child relationship ought to be maintained.

At the secondary level, placing drug information in the guidance, physical education, health or library areas of each school makes the information more easily accessible. Here the teacher-student relationship is perhaps not so vitally important, but material should be available for the student to use himself. It was suggested by several delegates that each school ought to have a pamphlet rack in the main foyer from which students could make their own selection; such a rack would have pamphlets on all aspects of human relationships, not just drug information alone.

What about outside experts?

The administration of a drug program was discussed at length. The role of a specially appointed outside "expert" would be to co-ordinate information and activities within the school organization, and with community service agencies as well. Such a co-ordinator, some delegates felt, could best establish and maintain a meaningful program for the inquisitive but as yet non-user of drugs.

A co-ordinator who was knowledgeable of the community's outside service agencies would also be better able to establish an effective after-school follow-up contact program for the student who is either addicted to drugs, or is an habitual user of drugs.

One administrative official stated that he questioned the competence of the educational system to do the job with present staff. He stated that the system would probably need new people with new skills. He also questioned education's prestige and image with the drug involved student. He questioned education's ability, sympathy and rapport as an institution to handle the problem with any kind of real meaning. He suggested that the education system ought to be cautious in estimating its ability, stature and competence with young people.

It was suggested that the role of a specially appointed outside "expert" as co-ordinator at the individual

board level would bring together the work of a board's social worker, psychologist, attendance counsellor, and guidance personnel. The point was made that, too often, these personnel work in separate areas and do not communicate with one another sufficiently. Each one has his own field of concern which seems to exclude the other concerns. A co-ordinator might bring all these concerns together, and at the same time establish and maintain contact with outside community service agencies to handle the kind of follow-up work necessary to keep individual students coping and functioning within the school system.

Educators should play the key role

The feeling was stressed, however, that educators are the best people to establish and maintain an effective program of education, rather than someone who is not a trained educator. As one educator said: "Experts to me are those people who relate well to children, and we hope those people are our teachers."

If the school system appoints a co-ordinator for a drug program, it might tend also to establish many similar positions - such as a co-ordinator for sex education, a co-ordinator to deal with growing violence, and co-ordinators for other problems that might arise. This would suggest that, in short order, there would be more administrative personnel in the board office than there would be teachers in the classroom.

The alternative suggestion to an outside "expert" co-ordinator seemed to be to utilize existing personnel in the health and physical education departments, whose functions could be co-ordinated at the board level. These personnel would use their experience and knowledge of outside community service agencies to work together to deal with the problem.

There seemed to be almost complete unanimity among the delegates on the inclusion of students in establishing and maintaining activities relating to the non-medical use of drugs; students should be consulted and involved at every step, and with regard to every aspect of whatever is discussed or planned by teachers or administrators.

Student participation can be initiated through any number of levels of student interest or involvement: public affairs clubs, debating clubs, students' councils or students' school service clubs.

The school principal can (and should) play the key role in any school project or activity or curricular program. Thus, for a start, his support and understanding and goodwill must be gained before anything is initiated. He is the person in the school who gets the teachers and students involved, and maintains their involvement.

At the secondary school level the physical education and guidance teachers often have especially close contact with the students. These specialists could act as mentors to the teachers and students who are actively involved in organizing and running various programs or activities.

Delegates were told that any effective program must include outside resource people with wide and differing points of view, so that the students themselves can learn to weigh and balance a variety of opinions, and so be educated in the truest sense of the word.

The delegates were also told that the education system must be prepared to relinquish considerable "control" if the community and the youth are to be given an effective and meaningful voice.

Several speakers stated that there ought to be a breakdown in the present distinction between teachers and students. Especially with regard to the drug problem, they suggested, there should be almost a complete reversal of roles. Time and agin, the delegates were told that schools must move away from propagandizing, and move closer to the real job of educating the child to learn for himself through a free exchange of opinions and viewpoints.

The question of whether the average school-age youngster has the life experience or depth of knowledge against which to make responsible value judgements did not arise.

The role of the classroom teacher was given only a cursory treatment in contrast to the outside "expert" coordinator, perhaps reflecting delegates' hopes that some kind of tangible magical answer could be found to this problem. Delegates seemed to avoid the fact that, particularly at the elementary school level, there is a heavy dependence on the teacher by the pupils.

Because delegates voiced the opinion that any program on drugs or human relations ought to be started as

early as possible in a child's education, it was considered that teachers might well be given in-service education in sensitivity training and human relations.

To many, there is little value in suggesting, as one or two delegates did, that students should simply learn to "knuckle down and accept things as they are." Students, they say, want to be heard, and they have a right to be heard as integral members of society; there is too much happening in the world outside the classroom to interest and to fascinate today's student for him placidly to accept the usual "school" style of learning.

While this line of reasoning seemed very much in tune with what often appears to be widespread current belief, there again seemed to be little attention paid to students' competence in making reasonable and responsible value judgements of their own.

Schools cannot act in a vacuum

The role of the community and of the parent in the total process of educating the youth is of prime importance. Delegates were told that the education system must devise ways and means of opening its doors to include parental participation, as well as the active involvement of outside agencies and "open-ended" interested community groups such as welfare personnel, youth service workers, doctors and lawyers. (One delegate made the point that the seminar seemed to be overly concerned with professional people within a community; he suggested that a community is also composed of business and industrial workers who ought to be included in any meaningful program).

Education cannot solve the drug problem in a vacuum. It must relate and become actively involved with the community it serves. Administrative and school staffs must know the sources of emergency care within the community so that students who "freak out," or who experience physical trauma due to drug use, can be given care; they must also be intimately familiar with other agencies which are working towards the same broad educational objectives as the schools.

In the case of non-physical trauma, or psychological or familial breakdowns which affect the competence and general security of a student, for example, the school is obliged to know the psychiatric counselling agencies for ongoing support and contact.

Furthermore, by involving pertinent outside community agencies, as well as the parents, the education system assures itself of a ready supply of resource personnel for in-service teacher education, for student assemblies or class and group discussions, and for continuing support of other sorts.

"There are three basic institutions in Canada which affect kids," a student told the delegates: "the home, the law and the school."

Education was criticized for doing little to bring all three together into one cohesive program for the students.

A police official at the seminar commented on the fact that most major police forces in Canada have set up special youth details. Most community agencies keep close consultative contact with these special policemen, but most schools do not consult with this force. Obviously there ought to be a much closer contact and mutual trust between the community's law enforcement agency and the school.

In preparation for this seminar, one administrative official said he visited his local police; he was overwhelmed at the evidence of drug usage by local students. This example indicates a great lack of communication with the police.

Whatever the approach of a school or school board in instituting programs to deal with the non-medical use of drugs, it seemed clear that all community resources ... professionals and non-professionals ... should be involved, including students. Perhaps the key point is that everyone participating should approach the problem on the basis of "I am ignorant, can you teach me?"

The present tendency of educators to feel possessive of the school system, it seemed clear, must cease.

Causes of the drug phenomenon

The underlying causes of the problem, and the attitudes towards these causes were discussed at some length.

One school administrator suggested that society was experiencing the results of post-industrial value changes. The old industrial values, based on honest toil and honest reward from that toil, are no longer relevant,

he suggested. The post-industrial society, with its new found affluence, is groping for new values.

Another point expressed was that society in general, and schools in particular, have been too reasonable, and too tolerant. The supporting comment was made that human beings cannot cope and function with freedom. The corollary was put forward that educators ought to determine the degree of freedom which safely can be allowed children at various levels.

In such a gathering as this seminar, where frank and open discussion took place with ease, it was interesting to hear, on the one hand, the suggestion that the drug problem could be minimized if society "clamped down," and on the other hand, that the extensive imposition of student values was essential if schools (and society at large) are to effectively react to such phenomena as the non-medical use of drugs.

One cause of the problem is that after school, on weekends and during the summer, after tight control in many classrooms, the routines of some students break down.

A delegate suggested that youth also has a responsibility to understand and to communicate with the older age groups. The core of the problem, as several speakers pointed out to the delegates, is not drugs, but human relations.

"There is too much emphasis on I and me. 'What is my thing' as opposed to 'What is good for all of us', "the delegate said.

One parent strongly suggested that a major cause of the problem seemed to be within the school system itself. This parent told the assembly that his son had become addicted to speed. When the parent went to the school with this information, the principal stated that the son's addiction had been known for some time. Yet this knowledge had not been communicated to the parents.

The parent accused the school system of creating and fostering an environment in which drugs are used and abused.

The apathy, the permissiveness, and the freedom given teachers today, the parent felt, is largely responsible for different values being instilled into youth.

The parent felt that prevention should be the basis of any program on drugs. He felt that drugs might be combatted by changing present attitudes and values. He accused the school system of playing ostrich, and waffling in the case of known drug users who " ... continue to circulate in the high schools ... and continue to contaminate other students."

Another delegate, a trustee, stated that the schools are suspicious and resentful of parental interest and concern. She felt that school-home communication is rigid and formal. Teachers and school administrators must learn to be open with the parents, and so establish meaningful communication.

In the view of students, the school system is not only the cause, but also "the enemy."

"To most kids," one student said at the seminar, "you (the educators) are the enemy, and you are the enemy not just because you're teachers, or because you make the curriculum. It's because schools mainly teach control mechanisms: to put your hand up, to ask to go to the washroom, generally to be quiet."

The student stated that after 12 or 13 years of being quiet in school, and quiet outside of school, a student ends up being quiet with himself.

Another student pointed out that what one says is very important to that someone - and when that someone is a student who is constantly told to be quiet, then very soon that student ceases to communicate, and becomes almost afraid to communicate. Thus some students, after they leave the school system for the day, for the week, for the year, or permanently go out into society, explode physically or emotionally in a mindless fashion.

A further cause of the drug problem is a feeling of inferiority in a social context. This was illustrated in the remark of a student, who was asked if she had ever taken drugs. Only marijuana and only once, she said. Why had she not continued using the drug? She explained that she really didn't like it.

"The kids respect me as I am," she said. "I go to parties, and sometimes they have drugs there, and if I wanted to I could take them. But no one pushes them."

The girl was asked would she take drugs if she did not have the respect of the other students, in order to try to be "in" with her fellows. Without hesitation, she said yes.

Obviously the force that makes a youth follow the fashion in music and dress is also at work in the drug scene.

It ought to be pointed out that the girl is athletic, a competent student, and has a very strong family relationship.

Program direction was a concern of the delegates at this seminar. Most delegates seemed to be in agreement that any program on drugs, or on the larger area of human relations, should be started as early as possible in a child's school career. Kindergarten was thought to be none too early to introduce the program.

Certainly any program ought to be fully operative at the grade seven and eight levels, when students are at the height of their curiosity and in the experimental stage.

At the elementary school level, from kindergarten to grade six, the teacher is of primary importance in the success of any programs. Therefore elementary school teachers ought to be given intensive in-service education not only on drugs, but also in human relations.

Even at the elementary level, pupils' questions ought to be dealt with frankly and openly in a group discussion atmosphere, it was felt.

At the secondary school level, the program direction is somewhat less dependent upon the teacher. Nevertheless, the consensus at the seminar was that secondary school teachers should also be given full in-service education on drugs, and in human relations.

All teachers should be aware of resource personnel and facilities in the school system, and in the community. Teachers are in regular and frequent contact with the students, and it is important that when teachers feel professional help is needed it is available.

One teacher at the seminar suggested that there ought to be more direct communication with the administration, rather than always through the principal's office. He stated that a principal sometimes takes it as a personal

affront to his administration if a student or teacher requests the services of a board social worker, psychologist, or psychiatrist.

As to the type of program to be directed to the parents, there was some disagreement. One delegate stated that parental programs should be left to other agencies in the community. He felt that schools haven't the time to educate students effectively, let alone the parents.

This was not, however, the majority opinion. Most delegates felt that there was little to be gained unless the parents were involved.

In summation, then, it is obvious that the program should be directed first to the specialist teachers of physical education, guidance and industrial arts or home economics; secondly, to the elementary and secondary school classroom teachers; and, finally, to the student and parent.

Realistic objectives necessary

Content of the program should be centred around realistic objectives. The delegates were told that the school cannot expect to eliminate all drug use by students; certainly, students themselves agree strongly with this statement. All the successful programs outlined by delegates at the seminar had found that the communities in which these programs operated came to accept the reality that some students will experiment with drugs.

The content of any successful program must, therefore, be largely based upon provision of objective information with a view to helping youngsters come to their own conclusions about the non-medical use of drugs. And if the seminar accomplished anything, it was that most of the educators present faced this reality. In former years, youth experimented first with cigarettes, then with alcohol; but today's youth have added a third dimension - drugs. Perhaps this is the simple basis on which the schools must approach the drug program. Youth must be provided with the knowledge to enable them to handle this new component in its proper perspective.

It was pointed out that students are interested in gleaning and discussing information on more than just drugs. Students need to be told the whole story according to their level of understanding. Educators and teachers must be prepared to speak frankly and openly, and expect the same frankness and openness in return.

The schools are obligated to provide whatever factual data is available.

As may be surmised, delegates at the seminar deliberated at considerable length not only on whether there should be a drug program or a human relations program, but also whether there should be a separate course of study, or if such a program should be an integral part of existing courses.

The "separate course of study" exponents felt that there was no existing course or courses into which a program on drugs or human relations would fit. The program ought to be a separate subject, headed by an outside co-ordinator appointed by the board who would be given the time necessary to develop and co-ordinate a cohesive program of study on drugs.

"If you have a message," one delegate said, "you must do it with a set curriculum."

But there was not wide agreement with this. One delegate stated that there were many sections of our society that would not accept the teaching of the beneficial effects of drugs as part of a drug education program; he felt that these sections of society would only accept the misuse and abuse of drugs for the basis of a drug program.

Other delegates strongly suggested that, even now, many students are complaining that they are being subjected to too much "information" about drugs. The logical places within the curriculum would be to incorporate the teaching of the use and abuse of drugs in health and physical education, or, some delegates thought, because it may also be a human relations problem, it could also be fitted into existing guidance programs.

Improving student-teacher relations within the regular classroom seemed to be a much better and more lasting approach - not only to the drug problem, but also to all the other concerns faced by young people in their maturing years ... sex, violence, social and moral values, responsibility and irresponsibility, authority and discipline.

"Human relations," one delegate said, is "simply a humane adult sitting down with young people once a week and being a good listener while allowing students to test their ideas and opinions and approaches with one another, and within the context of established mores."

Two examples of school projects

Several delegates, including a young teacher, stated that programs should originate at the local school level.

Two such programs were outlined briefly. The first program was one in which the school principal approached the members of the students' public affairs club. The 50 or 60 students in this club arranged an afternoon assembly and invited a panel of concerned adults from the legal, medical, business, and religious fields to discuss the causes of the drug problem. The students then organized an evening assembly to which the parents were invited. This evening meeting divided into small discussion groups with parents and students in each group. There was just one restriction: family members were not allowed in the same group. This made for more relaxed and freer discussions. This program resulted in a number of family counselling referrals.

Another high school tried an experiment using a one hour study period. The students were asked which persons they would like to hear from in the community regarding the drug problem. Their choice included a lawyer, a member of the local police youth detail, a Protestant and a Roman Catholic clergyman, a representative from the local YMCA, a member of the local Kiwanis Club, and a city health official. These citizens were invited for a one-day meeting at which each sat at a separate table set up in the school's auditorium. Study classes during that day were invited to go to the auditorium where they watched a film, and then engaged in a "talkabout," each student going to the table of his choice. There has not been sufficient time to evaluate this experiment, but within the school's community it has become easier to talk about the problem.

The Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario was asked to establish a student project on drugs in a small Ontario town. With the involvement of concerned adults and interested students, the project established a Drop-In centre for youth during the summer. Three or four doctors in the community volunteered to participate in regular free-flowing, open-ended discussions with young people. High school students themselves volunteered to set up recreation programs for the 13-18 year old age groups. The result was a new respect for individuals, regardless of age. Youth are now no longer found in over-reactive drug crises. In other words, there is a definite decrease in drug-related, problematic behaviour.

In all of these projects, it is important to note, students turned the various dialogues into avenues of concern other than drugs - thus indicating that drug use is to some extent merely a symptom of underlying concerns and frustrations.

But these isolated instances of successful programs, while interesting, hardly help school boards determine what pattern to pursue in dealing with drugs, student unrest, and other related problems. One delegate did, however, outline how his board has been dealing with the problem with some apparent success. The board concerned is Vancouver, where there has long been involvement and concern with drugs and youthful users and abusers.

Vancouver's "special counsellor" scheme

Eight or nine "special counsellors" form the core of the Vancouver board's program. They are picked each year from among 150 carefully-selected elementary and secondary teachers, guidance counsellors and/or department heads who have proved to be outstanding in relating well to the students. The eight or nine special counsellors selected from the 150 are given a course which "is easily equivalent to a master's degree."

Exactly how the drug problem is handled is decided at the local school level, but the special counsellors of Vancouver's Pupil Personnel Department are available as resource persons and for planning. Utilizing personnel from the Narcotic Addiction Foundation, the RCMP, Vancouver City Police, federal and provincial penal institutions, specialists from the University of British Columbia, and other institutions, these special counsellors are given intensive in-service education courses; nine sessions are devoted to problems of narcotics and drugs.

A less extensive program is provided for secondary school counsellors, and for all school administrators.

Educational programs relating to drugs should be developed, however, around the needs, questions and suggestions of the students as groups, or as individuals. In Vancouver, for example, the students pool their ideas and data to a point where, at times, they are defining their lack of knowledge. At this point the discussion leader or teacher suggests a need for further information, and may suggest a number of ways of gaining information about the topic: using a speaker, doing a project, or going on a field

trip. When this fact-finding has been achieved there is further discussion, and it appears to be at this point that students, however young, appear to form value concepts.

"Don't forget the parents," the Vancouver delegate emphasized. "They must be able to discuss drugs as intelligently as their children."

A continuing program is directed to the parents in Vancouver; it is based upon presentation of factual information, followed by small group discussions with a discussion leader who is usually a special counsellor from the Pupil Personnel Department.

Although drug education is a part of the Vancouver program, it doesn't form the whole program. Human relations, helping students to develop values and standards for themselves, form the main base of this program.

For the drug abuser there is "reality therapy," which is based upon the assumption that youth at the high school level are responsible for what they do. At this level, a drug-involved youth may be told that he's out of a school, but he may attend another school. He is told, however, that he will not get a third school. In other words, a youth may be told: "You want to use drugs, and you want to influence others to use drugs. That's fine, but you must also accept the consequences. Because you are a young, maturing person, the system will give you one other school. You won't get a third. You will be out of the system."

This procedure may sound harsh. At a roundtable discussion, however, the Vancouver delegate outlined the process whereby a youth who wishes to re-enter the system may do so. Soon after the youth's forced withdrawal from the system, he receives a letter from the Adult Education Department which lists the various courses open when the youth wishes to resume his formal education. The doors of the system are not irrevocably shut. The handle of the door, however, is on the outside. Only the youth can open it. This is a tried and true method used in the Alcoholics Anonymous program.

In general, the Vancouver program seemed to be the most sensible and practical approach discussed during the two days of the seminar. It seems to get at the heart of the problem, and emphasizes a long-range human relations and value-building approach.

21

From the Vancouver model, and from other programs that were discussed, several concrete points for developing an on-going, successful program emerged:

(1) Programs need to be developed for parents as well as teachers and students.

(2) Factual information, in the form of written or visual material, is only useful as a basis from which to develop small group discussions.

(3) Program personnel should be taken from existing employees of a school board, with outside agency personnel being utilized as resource people for in-service training, and for fact-finding.

(4) Small group discussions are preferable.

(5) Programs should begin at the elementary stage of a student's education.

(6) At the elementary level, the classroom teacher is the centre of the program as discussion leader.

(7) Factual information presented in an assembly atmosphere is of little value except as supplementary information.

(8) The human relations approach to a program seems essential. Students, especially at the secondary school level, are interested in depth discussions of subjects other than drugs, such as authority and discipline.

(9) People, not drugs, should be the basis for any program.

Summary of discussions at individual seminar sessions

On the following pages, an effort has been made to report the salient points put forward in each seminar session by speakers, commentators and delegates in the audience. This summary indicates the kind of free exchange of ideas and opinions which took place over the two days.

23

The schools' responsibilities and priorities

Speaker: Charles Simmons, Consultant for Special Programs, North York Board of Education.

For ease of reference, Mr. Simmons divided a community's culture into two stereotypes: the "straight" culture whose concern is productivity, and the "drug" culture whose concern is pleasure. He stated that these two cultures were in opposition to one another.

He told the delegates that outside agency personnel in the community should be brought into the school system only as resource people to be used in in-service teacher education programs. He felt that teachers should be responsible for drug education as they are the trained educators, and they are the ones with close daily contacts with youth.

In any drug program, he said, the schools should establish realistic objectives, and the community should be made aware of these objectives as well as the reasons for establishing them.

"Schools will not eliminate all drug use," he said. "I don't think schools should have this as an objective."

The schools must dispense with false rumours, and deal only with information proven through research. The schools must work with the mass media, perhaps by holding regular press conferences. He said that there must be an honest sharing of information with the mass media and the community so that, from the start of any drug program, there is a base of co-operative effort.

Teachers and students should be provided with sensitivity training. Both must explore the various avenues of human relations. There should be an increasing concentration on feelings through frank and open confrontations with every community agency, including the police. Finally, there must be a continuing evaluation of the total program with all levels concerned including the students.

Commentator: James Bain, parent

This parent accused the school of being the wedge between the child and the parent. He felt that the drug problem was perhaps caused by the growth of different values from those taught in the home. These different values he blamed on the school staff.

He inferred that the school system itself creates and fosters an environment in which drug use and abuse can and does exist, and even flourish. He stated that the school system does this by its apathy, by its permissiveness, and by the freedom given to teachers.

Prevention, he told the seminar, should be the basis of any meaningful drug program. Present attitudes and values should be changed, he stated, to combat the drug problem.

Mr. Bain condemned the school system for putting up with known, identifiable drug users who " ... continue to circulate in high schools ... and continue to contaminate other students." He asked the seminar delegates if one student is worth 16 other students who are influenced by the one drug user.

He suggested that the school systems have played ostrich, and have waffled in their handling of the drug problem.

Commentator: Gerald McCarthy, Superintendent of Schools, Dartmouth Board of School Commissioners.

This commentator stated that he felt the values of the drug culture are those of the post-industrial society. He questioned whether these new values were the preserve of drug users. He said that he believed Charles Simmons was flattering both the "straight" world and the "drug" world.

Mr. McCarthy said that the problem was as old as alcohol. In his opinion, the improvement, communication, transportation, and economic conditions were the real causes of the drug problem rather than any of the underlying reasons given by Mr. Simmons or Mr. Bain.

He agreed, however, with both of the previous speakers who stated that school was the best place to start a drug program. The business of schools is education, and they are geared to move quickly and easily into drug education for both parents and students. But he doubted the

effectiveness of such a program. He stated that there have been similar fruitless campaigns against "... all sorts of evils in the past. But this is no reason for not trying again."

Mr. McCarthy questioned the competence of the education system to be effective, with present staff, in dealing with students who have a drug problem. He said that the system will probably need new people with new skills.

He also questioned education's prestige and image with those students who have a drug problem. Perhaps they have been alienated beyond redeeming. He questioned education's credibility, sympathy, and rapport with these students. He suggested that education ought to be cautious in estimating its competence, stature, and ability to deal with the drug problem.

In closing his remarks, Mr. McCarthy suggested that educators look at the values of society as a whole. He stated that he agreed with Mr. Bain that education is a big part of any youth's life, and so "... to what degree does the education system contribute to a student's general feeling of loneliness and frustration."

Related questions and statements by delegates.

Question: How does North York handle the known pusher of drugs?

Answer (Mr. Simmons): Sometimes the youth is sent to another school. We start off with an automatic suspension, but generally we do not expel the youth. At the present time, we are developing teams of student counsellors who can make referrals to school staff members who then can make referrals to outside agency personnel, or to pertinent professional staff employed by the Board. Sometimes a youth will be referred to a student counsellor by a teacher, or by an outside agency person. It is this kind of mutual referral that we hope to foster.

Question: Were students involved in the planning of your program?

Answer (Mr. Simmons): They were very involved in our in-service education planning for teachers. We involved users, non-users, and some who had previously used drugs. The extent to which youth are involved in school program development, however, is up to the individual principals.

Question: What is your liaison with the morality squad?

Answer (Mr. Simmons): As a co-ordinator I do not have a close, working liaison with the police. But my staff team consults with the morality and youth departments of the police, as well as their community relations department.

Statement: School is involved with the development of the whole range of the human animal from kindergarten to 16 years of age. The "progressive" school movement in the United States fell flat as a continuing tradition of education because it lost sight of self-discipline on the part of the individual. From 3 years old to 93 years old ... no one wants to live completely loosely and unstructured with so-called complete freedom, and with chaos all around.

Statement: Schools must take a stand for or against drugs. Who is the student in your schools who gets the most care, the most concern, the most empathy, and the most attention? It's the drug user, or abuser.

Statement: The school system should be for or against specifics, not generalizations. If a youth is likely to perpetuate drug abuse, then he should be put out of the school system. But there is too much of the gangbuster approach to this problem with the young, curious experimenter. If it's bad for a person then be against it. It it's bad for that person's influence on others, then be against it. There are a lot of degrees of drug users. And there is a lot of "people" abuse going on in the name of helping people with their drug problem.

Statement: To me it is strange that cocktail parties to most people seems to conjure up a view of great guys and gals, the "straight" culture coming together having wiped the sweat of honest toil from their brow to be convivial and friendly. Yet a pot party has immediate connotations of the wicked, the evil, the sinister. If being for or against drugs means being that foolish, I think we'd better reconsider more carefully.

On the other hand, if we're prepared to wonder what is wrong with us that we find life so insupportable in the raw that we have to rush from honest toil, or whatever we are rushing from, to either kind of party, then we shall gain.

The crucial problem with our young people, I think, is that we've been so reasonable, and so tolerant about life in general around us.

27

Co-ordination of community resources

Speaker: Robert H. Gray, Assistant Director of Education, Ontario Addiction Research Foundation

The education system, Mr. Gray said, must work with its community. Outside agencies and interested open-ended groups, as well as community doctors, lawyers, welfare personnel and the general public of a community, ought to be involved in school drug programming. The school system alone cannot provide and maintain adequate follow-up contacts which will keep any student with a drug problem in school.

Youngsters who experience physical or mental traumas, or familial breakdowns, must be able to get emergency care. The school must know, therefore, what sources of emergency care there are in the community. The schools must also know the counselling agencies in the community that can provide on-going support for these students.

Outside agency personnel in the community are able to supply resource people for in-service teacher education, for talks to students in assembly, or in class, or in small groups.

Administrators as well as teachers must be as conscious, or more conscious, of the drug problem than the students are, said Mr. Gray. The community is pushing education to handle the drug problem, and the system cannot do this in a vacuum. Schools must relate to the community.

The Ontario Addiction Research Foundation (ARF) includes students and community citizens from every professional and non-professional level. Schools must do this too. Everyone must approach the problem with the attitude, "I am ignorant; can you teach me?"

Related questions and statements by delegates.

Statement: The school should handle the drug program on a preventive basis, and leave the addict to the

28

Drop-In Centres. Some people believe these Centres are perpetuating the problem by helping those youth who are in a drug crisis. One principal asked parents and students to help to establish a drug program. The result was that a task force was set up. The point here is that the school took the initiative to reach the uncommitted drug user, leaving the committed drug user to the Drop-In and Youth Centres.

Question: In preparing educational materials, does ARF involve young people who have been on drugs? I ask this because the youth in our area who have been exposed to ARF material feel that only one side of the picture is presented. Youth want also to be told the good effects.

Answer (Mr. Gray): Careful reading of our material will show that both sides are included.

Statement: Youth is interested in much more than just drugs. Their interests are wide and varied. The school system needs to co-ordinate all services both inside and outside the system, and involve these services in the general process of educating youth.

Statement: The problem is that teachers do not know about drugs. Teachers need to be told how and why drugs have been used in the past 30 years.

Statement: To me, a physical education teacher, developing a more intelligent, rational drug user is the only thing that makes sense because we are now in a drug society.

Statement: As an ex-teacher, and now employed by ARF, the genre of teaching which I find most effective is establishing an open rack in class of informational material on all subjects of interest to youth ... drugs, sex, pollution, and anything else of current interest to them ... then allowing students to break into small groups for discussion. This is the way to dissuade youth from anti-social behaviour.

Statement: Youth can also be detoured from the use of drugs through getting them involved in such activities as physical education, music, art, and drama. But strong teachers are needed for these subjects. This way will not eliminate problems in school, but it will tone the problem down. It gets youth into areas where values are more acceptable to society.

Statement: But young people have a responsibility to understand the older age groups too. We must move to the

core of the problem which is human relationship. With youth there is too much emphasis on "I" and "me". "What is my thing" as opposed to "What is good for all of us."

Question: How does ARF get involved with a school, or a community?

Answer (Mr. Gray): ARF will not go into a school or a community in Ontario unless there is someone, or some group of people, who will sit down with us and map out a program for community involvement.

The school system must decide whether they are going to co-ordinate community activity, or the alternative of naming one person as overall co-ordinator. This last suggestion recognizes the limitations of the system and the staff.

What the schools really ought to do is to make more use of youth in program development so that the programs are real -- to involve counselling services so that the program is preventive as well as helpful, and to establish a rehabilitative structure so those in need of help can get that help at whatever hour they need it. Students, parents, and teachers may be tired of drug education, and drug programs, until they face the problem directly.

Involvement of youth and parents

Speaker: Grant Lowery, Director, "12 Madison Avenue," Toronto.

Educators must not base their programs on propaganda. They must use resource people from a wide spectrum of viewpoints, and thus educate in the truest sense of the word.

The school system must relinquish considerable control over their schools if the community and the youth are going to be involved in meaningful drug programs. Indeed, there must be a breakdown in the existing distinction between students and teachers; in particular regard to drugs, there should be a complete reversal of roles.

There is a large amount of factual data on drugs now available, Mr. Lowery told the delegates, and the schools should include it in their programs. Students, parents, and teachers should be given the same information and treatment.

There is only a limited amount to be gained by approaching drugs as a separate topic within a curriculum. It is far preferable to include drug education in an interdisciplinary approach within all the school's teaching subjects under the theme of "man's dependence on chemicals." For instance, in geography, when studying various climatic conditions, man's use and dependence on drugs can be illustrated. In literature the drug problem could arise, and be examined when studying the writings of authors who were addicted to, and depended on, drugs.

In the years ahead, Mr. Lowery warned the seminar, there are going to be many other issues. Schools, therefore, must re-examine their role, and involve the youth and the community at large in this re-examination.

Commentator: David Clark, Head, Physical Education and Health, Centennial C.V.I., Guelph, Ontario.

Mr. Clark disagreed with Mr. Lowery. Mr. Clark felt that schools should have a set place in their curriculum

for dealing with the subject of chemical comforts. He agreed with Mr. Gray that schools must educate youth to cope with life in a drug oriented society. Drugs, he said, and drug use, cannot be prohibited.

The school curriculum must aim at the root of the problem, which is the people problem, not drugs.

Parent education, Mr. Clark said, should be left to other outside services. Schools, he felt, have not the time to educate youth effectively, let alone parents.

North York's idea of employing experts in the drug field is most worthwhile, he said.

Related questions and statements by delegates

Statement: Experts to me are those people who relate well to youth, and we hope we have these people teaching in our classrooms.

Statement: Parent education on drugs would be like our present open house for parents; those parents we should be reaching we do not reach.

Question: What is there in the attitudes of the schools, the teachers, the students, the administrators, and the trustees that makes the general public apathetic to schools?

Answer: That's the problem. The general public is apathetic. I think the schools are receptive to parents.

Statement: As a school trustee I do not think so. Communication from the school to the home is very stylized. There is no meaningful communication happening. There is a great need for more honesty.

Statement: If parents and youth are approached with honesty, I have found that I meet with happy results.

Statement: Why should it be up to the schools to start the ball rolling on this drug problem? Why shouldn't the parents or the community start it going. In some cases school officials might be wanting to perpetuate the problem in order to justify their positions.

Statement: We are in danger of talking the drug problem to death.

Question: Do schools drive youth to drugs?

Answer (Mr. Lowery): The school system does have an enormous impact for good or for ill on our youth. So if a youth becomes addicted to drugs, some of the responsibility for this happening is the school's.

Today, youth are attending school while under the influence of drugs. Before, youth took drugs, and dropped out of school. Some youthful drug users say this is the only way they can tolerate school. Other youth say drugs help them understand.

The school environment is unreal. It does not reflect what youth sees going on in the world. Drugs for a large majority of youth are reality.

Statement: Over the past 10 years schools have changed enormously, so much so that we the administrators can hardly keep pace. And outside the schools the pace is even faster leaving the community confused. So ... we are confused, the community is confused ... and we're really reflecting the times. (LAUGHTER) Sure, it's funny, but it's also pathetic.

Question: How can you tell youth that there are boring teachers, and this is part of life? How can you tell them that there are injustices in the school system, and that this is part of life too?

Answer: If you as educators and teachers can honestly and openly come out and say just that to youth, the battle or the hassle is almost over.

Question: How many students in metro Toronto are on drugs?

Answer: What do you include as drugs? Alcohol, for instance? If you include alcohol, there are at least 60 percent of youth between the ages of 12 and 20 who are using drugs regularly and frequently.

Counselling / treatment / rehabilitation

Speaker: Robert Couchman, Head, Counselling and Attendance Department, Etobicoke Board of Education.

It is ironic, Mr. Couchman said, that a few years ago there was widespread concern about school dropouts, then about unreached and alienated youth, and now in 1970 we are meeting in regard to the public's concern about drugs. But all along, the real, underlying, causal issue of the last 30 years has been sidestepped. That issue is human relationships.

Regarding drug education: by the time I see students they are already on drugs, and know more about them than the factual data presented by teachers. Originally, drug-using students were expelled from school, and the police were called. Now, however, the community feels that there are many "healthy, normal" youth using drugs so the community is now asking schools to provide counselling, therapy, and medical attention.

The majority of youth experiment with drugs for a limited period only, and then leave them along except on the occasional weekend. Most of these youth feel it was an interesting experience, but that they really do not need it on a regular basis. Yet any youth on drugs does need some kind of counselling and therapy.

There is a definite gap between the school system and the outside agencies, and the ability of both to locate young drug users to make successful referrals when required. In most cases, the young drug user and abuser has had a problem before he becomes involved in the drug adventure. The Ontario Student Records show this.

Some students should definitely be left alone unless they want help because they are not seriously upset, or disturbed. Other students using drugs who do need a little help can be helped by the school's services. But these school services cannot offer intensive therapeutic programs

for the addict. These programs must be obtained through outside agencies.

The school systems can best respond to students' needs by reinforcing or re-building existing services in the student services program. By strengthening existing school services, it will be easier to help young people get back to, and function in, the school system.

Schools ought to look at the whole curriculum, not just drug education. The schools need to examine how to promote sound learning environments. If schools' learning programs are exciting, then youth will not turn to drugs for mind-expanding adventure. If schools will utilize the energy, creativity and idealism of young people, and turn to avenues which will allow expression and criticism, then we will be able to get at the underlying causes of the problem.

Drug education as such should begin as early as possible, perhaps right at the kindergarten level.

In summary, then, there are four points: re-examine the present curriculum, start early with drug education, begin to build exciting school programs, and strengthen existing school services rather than create a brand new administrative position.

Commentator: Richard Sugarman, student, York University, Toronto.

Youth gets involved in many non-adaptive, self-destructive things.

It doesn't make much difference what you teach in school because when a student gets out he only uses a small fraction of what he has learned. School may teach nice discipline, but it does not teach much about how to do things on your own. Schools are run for teachers. Things are structured around how the teaching staff is going to feel.

Most youth take drugs as a medicine which they've prescribed for themselves.

Why should a student come to you with his drug problem? What can you do about it? What can you really do about it? If a student is going to talk to you about his drug problem he will, otherwise he won't. And you cannot make him talk about it.

Stop playing God! That's easy to do. Start playing real! That is not so easy.

In your youth the adults always asked "What are you going to be?" But today youth asks "What do you want to do?" Youth today wants to do, not be, which suggests being packaged.

The so-called pusher of drugs is no one person; he's everybody who uses drugs. The idea of getting rid of pushers means you're going to have to get rid of almost everyone who uses drugs ... and that is a lot of people.

In ten years time, the youth who are now one to six years old are going to revolt not out of any ideology, but out of the sheer pleasure of destruction.

We are living in one of the most affluent countries in the world, and yet we've got youth who want to do nothing else but kill themselves. Where's that at?

Related questions and statements by delegates.

Question: How do you as a student relate your courage in front of this group to the "repressive" kind of education you had in your earlier years?

Answer (Mr. Sugarman): I learned how to manipulate the system so that I did not need to be there very much. And then there were a couple of teachers I could speak to. The rest were write-offs. I learned how to play the game of academia very well. I suppose the most important thing I learned in school was how to "fake it."

Statement: Educators in some boards of education are appointing teachers who relate well to youth to head drug programs. This suggests that the majority of teachers do not relate to youth. Does this also mean that our teachers know their business of teaching so well that they cannot relate, or talk to students as human beings, as people, as individual persons? From statements made at this conference this seems indeed to be the case.

Statement: If you ask youth what they think and feel, you'll be told exactly. If this is upsetting to the point that educators are immobilized, then they should not be in the business.

If there is a teacher at this meeting I feel sorry for him because he will go back to his board with some good

ideas, but it will be extremely difficult to implement those ideas through the hierarchy of administrative personnel above him.

Boards of education are going to have to feel the pulse of the community, and be able to respond. They are going to have to be flexible, or establish a new structure.

Statement: My job as an educator is to educate you. My job is not to educate you in the way you want to be educated.

Answer: I disagree. The biggest problem the youth today have is coping with the world around them. The amount of information available to mankind in the next 70 years will increase 32 times. Schools are not teaching youth to cope and function with change. The name of the game today is change. And schools are not teaching youth how to play the game.

Statement: The open concept programs, and the student-structured curriculum, are not getting at the root of the problem at all. Education needs a lot more experimentation before it comes up with a viable method of educating young people. Toronto's SEED idea gains great enthusiasm from youth. School systems must "free-up" the structure so youth can have the SEED (Summer of Experience, Exploration and Discovery) kind of education adventure when they are ready for it.

Statement: Once when I was a salesman, the manager used to begin each sales promotion class with the word "enthusiasm" written in large, bold letters on the blackboard. Enthusiasm is one thing that money cannot buy. If a teacher is bored, the students will be bored.

Abuse of drugs is over-use of drugs. But drugs are fun. To try and tell a youth that drugs are not fun is ridiculous. But <u>doing things</u> is also fun, and interesting, and rewarding. Perhaps more so than drugs. Yet to most youth, taking drugs is not an important issue. The real issue is the problem that put them onto drugs.

Statement: the older generation was asked what do you want to be. In other words, what we wanted to produce. We were trained to be producers. This present generation is being trained to be consumers, rather than producers.

Question: You say youth enjoy drugs. But when one

sees drug users they are dull, stunned people. How do you relate these two?

Answer: Look at it from a youth's point of view. He goes through life always on the bottom, and always super-depressed. He tries drugs and feels a euphoria. Especially with speed. Speed gives one energy. But when he comes down, he returns to his original feelings of impotence and failure ... all the things he tried to escape. So he looks for more speed. Drugs have now become a necessary emotional diet. They make you feel happy, useful, and able to do things. Speed is a life style.

Developing school/community programs

Speaker: Donald Dawson, Senior Co-ordinator, Student Counselling, Vancouver Board of School Trustees.

Any program must serve to improve relations within the classroom. Human relations is simply a humane adult sitting down with youth once a week and discussing topics and/or problems selected by the youth. The teacher is merely a discussion leader. I am talking about improving relationships between teachers and youth, and between parents and teachers.

Having a set curriculum simply allows a teacher to take his or her perceptions of this curriculum, and implant his or her moral judgements. It does not allow students to test and to determine their own values.

In Vancouver we have adopted the attitude that although there is an overall drug problem, the handling of drug education must be decided at the local school level simply because the situation varies from one area of the city to another. Our special counsellors have sufficient orientation to be resource people for planning and for carrying out the type of program needed in each secondary and elementary school.

The rationale behind our educational efforts in Vancouver is based on the belief that drugs and other subjects relevant to students should be discussed in schools when and where there is a need, and that the classroom should be such that it is natural and normal for students to bring up and discuss a variety of problems.

The ideal approach seems to be the kind of human relations program initiated in Vancouver. Basically it is the discovery approach applied to a variety of controversial subjects. For example, if the question of drug use arises, what normally happens is that the students pool their ideas and data to a point where, at times, they are defining their lack of knowledge. At this point the discussion leader, or

teacher, suggests a need for further information and may suggest a number of ways of gaining information about the topic... through a speaker, a project, or a field trip. At the completion of this fact-finding there is further discussion, and it appears to be at this point that students begin to form their own value concepts.

At the elementary school level, the subject of drugs is dealt with through the use of objective films, filmstrips, speakers, and, best of all, a knowledgeable teacher. Drug education is best received before students are too emotionally involved in the problem... at grade 8 and down.

With secondary school students, it is essential not to attempt to frighten or to moralize. In our guidance classes, our teachers have a variety of resources available for use by students. Some examples of programs are: small-group discussion followed by fact-finding projects, films followed by seminars, human relations discussions, discussion groups with parents and pupils, discussion and speaker (i.e. a former heroin addict), group discussion with a doctor, panel discussion of parents and students, interviews and discussions with the Vancouver Police Drug Squad and Youth Preventive Squad.

In the past two years local high schools, the Adult Education Department, and our Pupil Personnel Division have combined to present to parents information regarding drugs and their effects, and the legal, sociological and educational implications. Four speakers are used to give strictly factual information. This is followed by small-group discussion using all our special counsellors as resource people.

If students are allowed to discuss contentious problems openly and long enough, their conclusions tend to substantiate the mores of established society.

Speaker: Mr. Bertil Montin, Curriculum Co-ordinator, Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Schools have a captive audience, the ability to collect data, and the resource personnel to assume leadership, or at least to take the initiative in creating a program on drug and narcotic education.

But any program, said Mr. Montin, needs the involvement and support of the total community right from the start of the planning. This Montreal did.

Discussion leaders are chosen by the local school principals and the district superintendents. In some schools the School Councils and the Student Councils were involved.

Particular emphasis is placed on teachers' ability to relate to young people. The training of these teachers as discussion leaders is of one-week duration for half a day each day. So far, the Board has trained 200 discussion leaders. These leaders meet with local home and school associations, attend service clubs and church organizations, show and comment on drug films, and generally make themselves available to the community.

Help and care, rather than expulsion and arrest, is the guideline for the drug education team in each high school. There must be a great deal more to any program than merely a hit-and-run warning.

Each school has been allowed to experiment with the implementation of the program at different grade levels, in different subject areas, in the curriculum and on a compulsory as well as on a voluntary basis. At the outset two years ago, all graduating classes were exposed to the program for some 6-10 hours on a compulsory basis. Today the seniors state they have had enough, and we work with the younger students. All or any student may, on a voluntary basis, be a part of an extra-curricular program. First and second year students usually participate on a compulsory basis.

During these specific periods on drug and narcotics education, the students view films and usually immediately following meet in small discussion groups. The content of the films,incidentally, would appear to be almost irrelevant. From our experience, the films serve as points of departure for discussions and the likes and dislikes of the content or acting become active catalysts in that process. The discussion leaders act as resource persons and avoid personal value judgements as much as possible.

Mr. Montin explained that the Montreal program is preventive in nature. That is, the focus is not placed upon habitual users but on the non-committed, uncertain, easily-influenced teenagers who will probably be exposed to many temptations with regard to drug abuse throughout their school careers.

Related questions and statements by delegates

Statement: Our school board invites students and teachers to attend meetings and take part in the debating and

discussing and deliberating.

Statement: Students are beginning to realize that they have power. In one meeting of students, one grade 12 student got up and said, "Let's get a union organizer in here." Furthermore, our principals are getting annoyed at the administration for allowing students to circumvent the line of authority, and go directly to the administration.

Statement: Teachers are looking for better working conditions, so why shouldn't the students. Our central office is now telling the principals that they cannot operate a school for staff comfort. Schools are in the business for students. If we're in the business for students, we are going to have to find out what students want; we're going to have to find out what's fair.

Statement: If you have a message to deliver to students, then it must be done with a set curriculum.

Statement: If you're talking of value concepts, not just drugs but the underlying value concepts and how they are formed, you must expose students to alternatives through resource personnel, with the teacher as discussion leader helping the students to examine their choices.

Statement: Too many principals are too busy administering. The principal is the headmaster, and as the top teacher in the school he should be out and around helping other teachers, and talking to students. Our responsibility as administrators is to create more and more avenues in which students can zero in. This is where the gap exists. In other words, the young students have their hands out to us, and at the same time our young teachers have their hands out to us as administrators to provide sensitivity training.

Teachers must learn to teach young people, not subjects. This concept must start at the teachers' college level.

Presenting real people to students to interview, and to gain information from them, has an immediacy and a real learning situation that is not available from any tape or film no matter how good they may be.

Curriculum considerations

Speaker: Dr. Hester Beth Bland, Consultant in Health Education, Indiana State Board of Health.

Dr. Bland warned the delegates that there are no easy answers to such complex problems as drug use and abuse. Teachers and other school personnel are frustrated in their attempt to meet increasing demands and interests of those they teach.

The current flood of magazine articles, newspaper releases and television reports related to drugs has led to confusion and misunderstanding. Currently, school officials are reassessing their positions, trying to identify their roles, and are searching for information that will give direction to effective and safe programs of drug education. Responsibility must be assigned, teachers prepared, lessons planned, and materials selected.

In view of these perplexities, Dr. Bland said, it may be appropriate to recognize and consider some of the school's problems related to teaching about drugs.

First, educators must be aware that many students will consider the teacher "out of tune with the times." It is harsh reality that students often will have more information about drugs, both good and bad, than those who teach -- for, unfortunately, many youths will be speaking from experience. Grim facts but true!

Second, a problem exists because teachers and counsellors have not been prepared either to teach or counsel about the use of drugs. They admit their lack of knowledge in this field. Not having been schooled in the subject, lacking direction, wanting to avoid controversy, and with an honest fear of doing more harm than good, the teachers often omit the subject or gloss over it with only superficial reference.

Third, without comprehensive sequential programs in health science, the school curriculum offers no framework for health subjects of special interest. These subjects become special programs presented by "outside experts" when they are available. If presented at all, the subject becomes a special offering slanted towards the interest

of the expert. If he is a law enforcement officer, enforcement will be the emphasis; if a physician, the emphasis will be on the medical aspects of drug misuse; if a gentleman of the cloth, the subject may have overtones of moralizing. All of these may be acceptable approaches and essential to over-all effective education about drugs. But the fragmented approach of special presentations sets the subject apart, dramatizes it, and surrounds it with more sensationalism than it should have. Only if education about drugs is part of the regular course of study will it receive the long-term emphasis necessary to understanding and appreciating the relation of drugs to health.

A fourth problem has been the paucity of positive long-range programs on drugs. School personnel want to learn from other school experiences. Administrators and teachers prefer to observe and adapt what they see. Successful programs are needed for reference. Truly effective school programs of drug education are needed as guides for those who are searching for help.

Dr. Bland briefly described the K-12 program on drugs which she had a part in writing for the American School Health Association; it was funded by the Pharmaceutical Association of the United States, which wanted to counteract the "...dirty connotation which the word drug has gained." The program presents very general guidelines for the teacher. According to Dr. Bland it merely provides a starting point for local school curriculum development. She emphasized that such a curriculum guide cannot help all people or all situations unless it is adapted to the local scene.

Commentator: Emerson Lavender, Assistant Superintendent, Halton County Board of Education, Oakville, Ont.

Mr. Lavender disagreed with earlier statements that the number of students dropping out of school and/or becoming alienated from society is increasing. He stated that this was just not so in Ontario. He disagreed that teachers are teaching subjects, not people. He stated that the majority of youth today are not rejecting established society and its values. He stated that youth does not know what it wants or needs. He also disagreed with the statements that schools and their programs are out of date, or that schools and programs are unsensitive to the needs of youth. He did feel that there is no present framework in which to fit the drug curriculum.

Related questions and statements by delegates

Statement: Any approach to the drug education program

should be based on the discovery approach according to the needs of youth, at a time and place and in a way which youth wants. The content, time spent, and methodology should reflect the needs and wants of youth, not of a curriculum devised by adults.

Answer (Dr. Bland): The ASHA drug education curriculum can be integrated into a health program over a long period of time, or it can be integrated into a social science program.

Statement: Drugs, like other similar subjects, are just a manifestation of the underlying problem. The heart of the problem is the barrenness of today's values. How do you teach youth how to build perspectives, and some values and priorities of their own?

Question: Were youth involved in putting together this drug education program?

Answer (Dr. Bland): No. They were not involved.

Statement: The thing that concerns me about this drug education program is that the school is not the single agency for educating youth. There are other teachers of youth: namely the home, the community, and the peer group. School is only one part of it.

Answer: Peer pressure is most important to youth. School, however, is the way to help youth develop positive attitudes.

Statement: To be successful in teaching about drugs, we must start with parents. So community agencies must be involved.

Question: Is the curriculum you've developed, Dr. Bland, useable for parents?

Answer: Yes, in a selective way. There are, of course, hazards to using package materials.

Statement: As a teacher fairly new to the field, I feel that I need guidelines. The development must be left to the local school and teacher.

Delegates and program participants

Allen Andrews, Youth Co-ordinator, Prince Edward Island Department of Education, Charlottetown.

G. Bruce Atkinson, Consultant in Alcohol and Narcotic Education, Nova Scotia Department of Education, Halifax.

G. J. Bogg, Physical Education Consultant, East York Board of Education, Toronto.

D. G. Bogstow, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Ontario Department of Education, Toronto.

James W. F. Bole, Scarborough, Ontario.

Dr. John Bowman, Provincial Supervisor of Guidance, Manitoba Department of Education, Winnipeg.

Dr. Garnet Bull Bland, Consultant in Health Education, Indiana State Board of Health, Indianapolis.

Wilson Brown, Principal, Mount Forest Public School, Mount Forest, Ontario.

G. G. Caldbeck, Director, Special Educational Services, Victoria Board of School Trustees.

David Clark, Head, Physical Education and Health, Centennial C.V.I., Guelph, Ontario.

Dr. Harold E. Clemens, Assistant Director of Guidance, Toronto Board of Education.

Miss Marjorie A. Cook, Director of Special Services, Halifax Board of School Commissioners.

Robert Cochrane, Head, Counselling and Attendance Services, Kitchener Board of Education, Ontario.

Miss E. Mary Craig, Supervisor of Special Education, North Vancouver School District.

Donald M. Dawson, Senior Coordinator of Counselling, Department of Research and Special Services, Vancouver Board of School Trustees.

Greg L. Donovan, Commissioner of Youth, Province of Nova Scotia, Halifax.

William P. Ewart, Supervisor of Special Education and Guidance, Regina Public School District and Regina Collegiate Institute Board.

James Gilchrist, Head, Physical Education, Thornhill Secondary School, Thornhill, Ontario.

A. Grant Gillespie, Director of Education, York Board of Education, Toronto.

Robert H. Gray, Assistant Director of Education, Addiction Research Foundation, Toronto.

Dr. Kenneth M. Grierson, Director, Bureau of Child Study, Edmonton Public School Board.

J. E. Griffiths, Superintendent of Student Services, North York Board of Education, Toronto.

E. C. Hammond, Chief, Division of Narcotic Control, Department of National Health and Welfare, Ottawa.

Richard J. Harvey, Director of Pupil Personnel Services, New Brunswick Department of Education, Fredericton.

A. E. Higuchi, Administration Assistant, North York Board of Education, Toronto.

J. E. Jones, Superintendent of Secondary Schools, Calgary Public School Board.

Miss Carol Jongen, Physical Education Teacher, Eastwood Collegiate Institute, Oshawa, Ontario.

Dr. Morton Johnston, Supervisor of Guidance, Ottawa Board of Education.

André Lacombe, Conseiller d'orientation professionnel, Direction générale de la planification, Ministère de l'Education du Québec.

Emerson E. Lavender, Assistant Superintendent, Halton County Board of Education, Oakville, Ontario.

A. J. Longmore, District Superintendent of Schools, Victoria Board of School Trustees.

Grant Lowerey, Director, 12 Madison Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

Jack McCabe, Co-ordinator of Guidance, Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board.

Dr. David B. MacDougall, Supervisor of Guidance, Edmonton Separate School District.

M. McCabe, Oak Park Junior High School, Toronto.

Gerald J. McCarthy, Superintendent of Schools, Dartmouth Board of School Commissioners.

Thomas W. McConaghy, Editor, The ATA Magazine, The Alberta Teachers' Association, Edmonton.

Dr. A. McKinnell, Chief Psychologist, Peel County Board of Education, Mississauga, Ontario.

Dr. Thomas J. Malcho M.D., Toronto.

Richard G. Marsan, Directeur médical, Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal.

Thomas Martin, Chief Pharmacist, York-Finch General Hospital, Downsview, Ontario.

Dr. Ralph D. Miller, Research Associate, The Drug Enquiry Commission, Ottawa.

D. G. Morris, Curriculum Co-ordinator, Guidance and Educational Services, Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

D. T. Morris, Director of Guidance, Saskatoon Collegiate Institute Board.

A. G. Mutter, Director of Instruction, School District 43, Coquitlam, B.C.

Miss Gilleen Nesbitt, Co-ordinator of Drug Education Program, South Vancouver School District.

Al Nichols, Director, Counselling Services, Edmonton Public School Board.

Dr. Kenneth A. Parker, Superintendent of Schools, Charlottetown Board of School Trustees.

D. J. Phillips, Assistant Superintendent of Program, York Board of Education, Toronto.

Arthur Pottle, Saint John Board of School Trustees.

Larry Power, Superintendent of Curriculum and Special Services, Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board.

Charles Prince, Director of Physical Education, Toronto Board of Education.

Dr. David Randall, Children's Services Branch, Mental Health Division, Ontario Department of Health, Toronto.

Viateur Ravary, Directeur du Service des Etudes, Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal.

William N. Roman, Superintendent - Services, Sudbury Board of Education, Sudbury, Ontario.

Kenneth Self, Superintendent of Program, Halton County Board of Education, Oakville, Ontario.

A. P. Selinger, Superintendent of Secondary Instruction, Regina Separate School Board.

Edward Sichewski, School Counsellor, St. James-Assiniboia School Division, Winnipeg.

Charles Simmons, Consultant for Special Programs, North York Board of Education, Toronto.

Murray R. Smith, Deputy Assistant Superintendent, Winnipeg School Division.

Ray Speer, Supervisor of Adjustment Services, Hamilton Board of Education.

J. Stroebel, Head of Physical Education, R. H. King Collegiate Institute, Scarborough, Ontario.

Richard Ungerman, Toronto.

E. W. Vaupre, Assistant Superintendent, Brandon School Division, Brandon, Manitoba.

Arthur Sweeney, Supervisor of Physical Education, Hamilton Board of Education.

Eugene A. Torgunrud, Associate Director of Curriculum, Alberta Department of Education, Edmonton.

E. J. Weiss, Director, Drug Education, Peel County Board of Education, Mississauga, Ontario.

Arthur C. Whealy, L.L.B., Toronto.

Mrs. J. R. Woodyatt, Toronto.

About the author

Michael Rose is a graduate of the University of Manitoba. He taught English and History in Winnipeg and Metro Toronto. Now a freelance journalist in Toronto, he is the author of A Teacher's Guide to a Writing Workshop (Copp Clark, 1968), Creative English- Grade 8 (Copp Clark, 1968) and Action English- Grade 9 (W. J. Gage, to be published in 1971).